

3-1-2000

**Letter to RJM re: PETITION FOR HEARING TO REVIEW DENIAL)
OF MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION; TO CORRECT DOCKET
ENTRIES OF 98-6901 (L) AND 99-9084 (CON)**

N. Z. Ramos

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.nyls.edu/law_clerks_memos



Part of the [Courts Commons](#), and the [Judges Commons](#)

NORA Z. RAMOS
P. O. Box 70 - 1190
East Elmhurst, NY 11370 - 3190

718-956-1854

March 1, 2000

RECEIVED

MAR 0 2000

ROGER J. MINER
U.S. CIRCUIT JUDGE
ALBANY NEW YORK

CERTIFIED MAIL, R R R

Honorable Roger J. Miner
Senior Circuit Judge
US Court of Appeals
For the Second Circuit
445 Broadway
Albany, N Y 12207

Re: 98-6901 (L) Grievance Committee v. Ramos
99-9084 (Con) Ramos v. Mangano, et al
USCA for the Second Circuit

Dear Honorable Roger J. Miner:

Enclosed is a copy of the Petition for a hearing that I filed on February 22, 2000 at the Clerk's Office, US Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, 40 Foley Square, New York, New York.

I am writing you directly because I believe that violation of the law has become the regular course of events and a common occurrence in my above-entitled appeals.

The errors and omissions started at the docket entries of 99 CV 1256 (CPS) (ASC), USDC, EDNY, appealed under docket no. 99-9084 (Con) that omitted at the caption the name of defendant-appellee John A. Monteleone, the Special Referee who suppressed the material evidences favorable to me at the State disciplinary proceedings. Petition, page 8, par. 28.

The said docket entries also changed to \$0. my demand for damages of \$154,000 (actual), \$5,000,000 (compensatory) and \$5,000,000 (punitive). Petition, Page 8, par. 29.

The errors at the docket entries of 95 CV 3192 (CPS) USDC, EDNY, appealed under docket no. 98-6901 (L) are substantive.

Nora Z. Ramos' letter of 3/1/2000
Page 2

The docket entries at 95 CV 3192 dated January 29, 1998, document 22, is not true. I did not have a hearing on January 29, 1998 nor at anytime, on my motion for protective order to suppress designated pages of the transcripts of February 10, 1995, August 4 and 11, 1995. Petition, page 6, par. 17.

The docket entries at 95 CV 3192 dated November 9, 1998, document 30, is not true. I did not have an attorney disciplinary proceeding nor a hearing of my motion to reconsider the memorandum and order of September 29, 1998, before Honorable Chief Judge Sifton on November 9, 1998 nor at anytime. Petition, page 7, paragraphs 21, 22, and 23.

Civil Appeal Schedule no. 1 (docket no. 98-6901), dated November 13, 1998, was issued in violation of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rule 4 (a) (4) and the case of Schroeder v. McDonald, that suspends the notice of appeal until the disposition of the post-judgment motion I filed on October 14, 1998. Petition, page 11, paragraphs 44 and 45.

On November 9, 1998, I filed my acknowledgment of the docketing letter, Forms C and D attachments to my notice of appeal filed on October 27, 1998, with a covering letter addressed to Deputy Clerk Michael Adragna, USCA for the Second Circuit, informing him of my above-described motion for reconsideration filed on October 14, 1998, to be heard on October 27, 1998 adjourned to November 10, 1998 at 4:30 P.M. Petition, page 11, par. 46.

On October 6, 1999, I filed my acknowledgment of the docketing letter dated September 23, 1999, with a covering letter informing Deputy Clerk Angela Brogna, USCA for the Second Circuit, of the herein described errors and omissions in the docket entries of 99 CV 1256 (99-9084). Petition, page 13, par. 56.

I also informed her in said letter that I was not yet assigned a docket number as of September 21, 1999, when I filed my motion to consolidate 98-6901 and 99 CV 1256; Forms C and D attachments to my notice of appeal filed on September 8, 1999; copies of the District Court's judgment, memorandum and order; and the New York State Supreme Court, Appellate Division's opinion and order of February 20, 1996. Petition, page 12, pars. 49, 51, 52.

Nora Z. Ramos' letter of 3/1/2000
Page 3

On November 3, 1999, before the appeals were consolidated, I filed my motion to correct and settle the errors in the docket entries of 99 CV 1256 (under docket no. 99-9084). Petition, page 5, par. 13 and page 8, par. 28.

Ms. Brogna sent me a letter dated November 5, 1999 amending the caption of docket no. 99-9084 to include defendant-appellee John A. Monteleone. Petition, page 10, par. 37.

On November 19, 1999, I received an order filed on November 12, 1999 (Friday) consolidating the appeals, and ordering me to file my appeal papers on or before November 14, 1999 (Sunday). Petition, page 13, par. 53.

On the same day, I received a letter dated November 15, 1999 from Mr. Adragna with an enclosed very confusing and indistinguishable format of the consolidated captions, again omitting in the caption the name of defendant-appellee John A. Monteleone. Petition, page 13, par. 54.

On November 23, 1999, I filed a motion to correct and settle the errors in the format of the consolidated captions, in the caption that deleted the name of defendant-appellee John A. Monteleone, in the docket entries of 95 CV 3192, to extend the time to file the brief and appendices and for the District Court to forward the record on appeal to the Court of Appeals. Petition, page 2, par. 3 and page 6, par. 14.

By order of December 8, 1999, my motion under the unconsolidated docket no. 99-9084 (filed on November 3, 1999) to correct the erroneous docket entries of 99 CV 1256 was referred to the panel that will hear my appeal. Petition, page 2, par. 2, page 3, par. 5 and page 14, par. 62.

Looking at the docket entries of 98-6901 (L), page 7, the Court orders of December 8, 1999 and January 19, 2000 were made to appear to have decided my motion of November 23, 1999 (dealing with the erroneous docket entries of 95 CV 3192).

Nora Z. Ramos' letter of 3/1/2000
Page 4

The data entries of January 19, 2000 shows that the order denying my motion to reconsider the order of December 8, 1999 was filed under docket no. 98-6901.

The orders of December 8, 1999 and January 19, 2000 decided the motion of November 3, 1999 (dealing with the erroneous docket entries of 99 CV 1256) under docket no. 99-9084.


The motion of November 23, 1999 is still pending.

The above-described orders violate my right to the certified docket entries of the proceedings pursuant to Appellate Rule 10 (a) (3). Petition, page 10, pars. 39, 40, 41.

The said orders also deprived me of my right to the corrected and modified record pursuant to Appellate Rule 10 (e) (1) and (2) and Appellate Rule 30 (a) (1) (A).

I will greatly appreciate all the help you can extend to me.

Very truly yours,


Nora Z. Ramos
Pro se
30-69 Hobart Street #B3I
Woodside, N Y 11377

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

-----X
In Re: NORA Z. RAMOS, Esq., An Attorney
and Counselor-at-Law,

Respondent - Petitioner,

GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK,

Petitioner - Respondent,

v.

NORA Z. RAMOS, Esq.,

Respondent - Petitioner.

-----X
NORA Z. RAMOS, Esq.,

Plaintiff - Petitioner,

v.

GUY JAMES MANGANO, Presiding Justice
of the Appellate Division, Second Department
of the Supreme Court of the State of
New York, Associate Justices VINCENT R.
BALLETTA, JR., ALBERT M. ROSENBLATT,
CORNELIUS J. O'BRIEN, THOMAS R.
SULLIVAN, Justice, ROBERT H. STRAUS
and BARRY KAMINS, Chief Counsel and
Chairman, respectively, of the Grievance
Committee for the Second and Eleventh
Judicial Districts (Grievance Committee),
JOHN DOES and/or JANE DOES (1-20),
Being Present Members of the Grievance
Committee, JOHN A. MONTELEONE,
Being a Special Referee, and DAVID
C. Y. CHEUNG, Being Assistant Counsel
to Robert H. Straus, all in their
official and personal capacities,

Defendants - Respondents.

-----X

Docket No.
98-6901 (L)

RECEIVED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT
JAN 23 1999
CLERK

Docket No.
99-9084 (Con)

PETITION FOR
HEARING TO
REVIEW DENIAL
OF MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION;
TO DECIDE ON
11/23/99 MOTION;
TO CORRECT
DOCKET ENTRIES
OF 98-6901 (L)
AND 99-9084 (CON)

1. This proceeding involves one or more questions of exceptional importance (Rule 35 (a) (2) and Rule 35 (b) (1) (B) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure. The herein questioned orders are in conflict with Appellate Rule 10 (a) (3), Appellate Rule (e) (1) and (2), and Appellate Rule 30 (a) (1) (A).

2. Petitioner NORA Z. RAMOS petitions the Court for a hearing to review the denial on January 19, 2000 of her motion to reconsider the order of December 8, 1999 before Honorable Robert D. Sack, Circuit Judge of this Court, signed for Karen Greve Milton, Acting Clerk, by Beth J. Meador, Administrative Attorney (99-9084).

3. Ramos hereby petitions the Court to decide on her motion filed on November 23, 1999 (98-6901 (L) and 99-9084 (Con), in order to correct the errors in the format of the consolidated captions, in the caption that deleted the name of defendant-appellee John A. Monteleone, in the docket entries of 95 CV 3192 (CPS), USDC, EDNY, to extend the time to file the brief and appendices to forty days from the settlement of the erroneous docket entries and to order the District Clerk to forward the record on appeal to this Court as in Civil Appeal Schedule Order # 1 (98-6901).

RECEIVED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT
JAN 23 11:11 AM
NEW YORK, N.Y.

4. Ramos further requests this Court to correct and settle the erroneous docket entries of 98-6801 (L) and 99-9084 (Con).

5. By order of December 8, 1999, Ramos' motion under the unconsolidated docket number 99-9084 to correct and settle the erroneous docket entries in Ramos v. Mangano, et al, 99 CV 1256 (CPS) (ASC) USDC, EDNY, was referred to the panel that will hear her appeal.

6. Ramos' two notices of appeal (98-6901 (L) and 99-9084 (Con) were consolidated by order of November 12, 1999 signed for Karen Greve Milton, Acting Clerk of this Court, by Lisa J. Greenberg, Staff Counsel.

7. 98-6901 (L) originated from an appeal to a memorandum and order filed on September 29, 1998 in the case of Grievance Committee v. Ramos, 95 CV 3192 (CPS) USDC, EDNY, suspending Ramos' nunc pro tunc from the practice of law in the Eastern District of New York for five years, commencing February 20, 1996.

8. 99-9084 (Con) originated from an appeal to a memorandum and order filed on August 6, 1999 in the case of Ramos v. Mangano, et al, 99 CV 1256 (CPS) (ASC), USDC, EDNY (99 CV 1256), dismissing Ramos' complaint.

RECEIVED
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
NOV 12 1999

9. 99 CV 1256 seeks to vacate and enjoin the defendants' from enforcing the New York State Supreme Court, Appellate Division's (Appellate Division) orders of suspension dated June 23, 1995 and February 20, 1996, to reinstate Ramos' license to practice law, to get award of actual (\$154,000.), compensatory (\$5,000,000.) and punitive damages (\$5,000,000.), attorney's fees and costs.

10. The issues to be raised on appeal are discussed in Forms C of docket number 99-9084 regarding this Court's original jurisdiction over Ramos' claims of violation of her Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination through compulsion by the use of illegal subpoena (issued without committing any professional misconduct and without any complaint filed against Ramos) and by the threatening letters of the Grievance Committee to obtain privileged bookkeeping records of a solo law practitioner.

11. Form C (99-9084) also discussed that since the records show that Special Referee John A. Monteleone had suppressed material evidences favorable to Ramos that will exonerate Ramos from the charges against her, and in view of the quasi-criminal nature of the disciplinary proceeding against an attorney,

a) Whether Criminal Procedure law sections 440.10 (1) (h) and (f) apply to Ramos, an attorney, which permits the Court to

91:1111-3303373

vacate a judgment "obtained in violation of a right under the Constitution of this State or of the United States"

(CPL 440.10 (1) (h), and on the ground that the conduct at issue is improper and prejudicial (CPL 440.10 (1) (f) ?

b) Whether CPL 60.45 (2) (a) and (2) (b) (ii) and CPL 710.70 apply to Ramos, an attorney, in reference to statements obtained "in violation of such rights as the defendant may derive from the Constitution (CPL 60.45 (2) (b) (ii) and "undue pressure which impaired the defendant's ability to make a choice whether or not to make a statement" CPL 60.45 (2) (a) ?

12. Ramos also raises the issues whether the defendants Justices are liable to suit because of their inherent authority to enforce the Code of Professional Responsibility, whether Ramos was denied the full and equal benefit of the laws pursuant to section 101 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 (amending 42 USCS 1981) and whether the defendants have violated clearly established statutory and constitutional rights to be held personally liable to Ramos.

13. On November 3, 1999, before the two appeals were consolidated, Ramos filed a motion under docket no. 99-9084 to correct and settle the erroneous docket entries in 99 CV 1256 pursuant to Appellate Rule 10 (e) (2) (C).

91:1117 73 83300

14. Ramos has a pending motion filed on November 23, 1999 as described on page 2 paragraph 3 of this petition. Ramos is seeking to correct the erroneous docket entries of 95 CV 3192.

15. The "et al" at the caption of 95 CV 3192 (CPS) must be deleted. Ramos had practiced law as a solo practitioner.

16. There is no docket entry at 95 CV 3192 (CPS) regarding Ramos' letter dated September 15, 1997 to Honorable Chief Judge Sifton informing him that the certificate of service of Ramos' notice of omnibus pretrial motion and affidavit in support with exhibits A to Z, filed on September 12, 1997 was stamped September 12, 1998 at the District Court Clerk's Office.

17. In 95 CV 3192 (CPS), the data entry of January 29, 1998 - Document 22, must delete "Motion hearing." Ramos did not have a motion hearing nor oral argument on her motion for protective order filed on January 29, 1998 at the District Court.

18. Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 26 (c) (1), Ramos filed her motion to suppress and exclude in evidence designated pages of the transcripts of February 10, 1995, the transcripts of August 4 and August 11, 1995 that contain self-incriminating statements about privileged documents obtained under compulsion in violation of her Fifth Amendment rights.

91:1117 708317

19. In 95 CV 3192 (CPS), the entries dated February 17, 1998 - document 23, February 23, 1998 - documents 24 and 25, and March 4, 1998 - document 26, show that Ramos sent four confirmation letters dated February 3, 7, 17 and 25, 1998 to Honorable Judge Sifton inquiring about the hearing of her motion.

20. The entry of February 17, 1998, document 23, did not show that in Ramos' letter of February 7, 1998, she requested to be clarified as to the "motion hearing" entry of January 29, 1998.

21. In 95 CV 3192 (CPS), the docket entry dated November 9, 1998, document 30, is not true. Ramos did not have an attorney disciplinary proceeding before Honorable Chief Judge Sifton on November 9, 1998 nor at anytime.

22. Ramos' motion to reconsider the District Court's memorandum and order of September 29, 1998 due to the clearly erroneous findings of facts (Fed. Rules of Civ. Proc., Rule 52) was filed on October 14, 1998 set for hearing on October 27, 1998 was adjourned to November 10, 1998 at 4:30 P.M.

23. Ramos' said motion (95 CV 3192) was not heard before any Judge at anytime. She also did not agree to Camille Frasier, from Lisa J. Greenberg's office, who called Ramos on November 19, 1998 asking her to withdraw her appeal (98-6901).

COPIES 22 FEB 22 11:17

24. On November 10, 1998 at about 5:00 P.M., although Ramos' case was not listed in the Court calendar she appeared before Honorable Judge Sifton for five to ten minutes.

25. Chief Judge Sifton gave Ramos the impression that her records were already forwarded to this Court. Since she needed time to retrieve her files for the Judge to decide on her motion, she agreed to the adjournment of the hearing to January 7, 1999.

26. Upon Ramos' motion filed on November 24, 1998, Honorable Chief Judge Sifton, by order of December 8, 1998 (95 CV 3192 (CPS)), reset the date of hearing to December 15, 1998 of her motion for reconsideration, further stating that the motion will be decided upon prior submissions without oral argument.

27. By memorandum and order filed on May 5, 1999 (95 CV 3192 (CPS)), Ramos' motion for reconsideration was denied.

28. Ramos' motion of November 3, 1999 (99-9084) seeks to correct the data entries of 99 CV 1256 that omitted in the caption the defendants-appellees Special Referee John A. Monteleone, John Does and/or Jane Does (1-20), Grievance Committee members.

29. The docket entries of 99 CV 1256 changed to \$0. Ramos' demand for actual damages of \$154,000; compensatory damages of \$5,000,000 and punitive damages of \$5,000,000.

FILED 11 25 03 11

30. The docket entry did not mention defendants-appellees John A. Monteleone, John Does and/or Jane Does (1-20), including Chairman Mark Longo (99 CV 1256, March 5, 1999, document 1).

31. The data entry did not show that the motion to dismiss the complaint was set for submission to the District Court on June 25, 1999 (99 CV 1256 (99-9084), May 10, 1999 document 3).

32. The entry did not include Ramos' memorandum of law sent in one envelope by express mail on June 13, 1999 to the District Court at the same time with her affidavit in opposition to the motion to dismiss (99 CV 1256, June 14, 1999, document 5).

33. It was not shown that those were additional copies of the memorandum of law and affidavit in opposition, with table of authorities sent to the District Court on June 19, 1999 (99 CV 1256 (99-9084), June 22, 1999, documents 6 and 16).

34. Ramos' letter of June 24, 1999 to District Court Judge Sifton confirmed a call from his office about the adjournment of the motion from June 25, 1999 to July 15, 1999, but she did not state that it was for oral argument (July 12, 1999, document 9).

35. Ramos' requested to delete the entries of July 14, 1999 document 12 and the July 16, 1999 document 11. No such papers were filed on said dates (99 CV 1256 (99-9084).

RECEIVED
JUL 17 1999
U.S. DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

36. Section 101 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 (amending 42 U S C S 1981) and Attorney General Eliot Spitzer as attorney for defendants-appellees must be in the docket entries of 99 CV 1256.

37. In a letter dated November 5, 1999 by Deputy Clerk Brogna, before the appeals were consolidated, the caption of docket number 99-9084 was amended to include defendants-appellees John A. Monteleone, John Does and/or Jane Does (1-20).

38. The orders of January 19, 2000 and December 8, 1999 (docket number 99-9084) discriminate against Ramos in violation of her right to equal protection of the law as guaranteed by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution and Section 101 of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 (amending 42 U S C S 1981).

39. Ramos is being denied her right pursuant to Appellate Rule 10 (a) (3) to the certified docket entries of the proceedings (95 CV 3192 (CPS) and 99 CV 1256 (CPS) ASC), USDC, EDNY).

40. Without the Court immediately correcting and settling all the erroneous and conflicting docket entries, the said entries cannot be certified as true, accurate or genuine by the District clerk.

41. Without the certified docket entries, the record does not constitute the record on appeal as defined by Appellate Rule 10 (a) (1), (2) and (3).

RECEIVED
FEB 11 11:17

42. Therefore, the forty days after the record is filed within which Ramos must serve and file a brief, pursuant to Appellate Rule 31 (a) (1), cannot begin to run.

43. Likewise, Appellate Rule 30 (a) (1) (A) intended "the relevant docket entries in the proceeding below" included in the appendix, to be the corrected and settled docket entries.

44. Civil Appeal Schedule no. 1 (98-6901) dated November 13, 1998 signed by Lisa J. Greenberg, Staff Counsel, for Carolyn Clark Campbell, then Clerk of this Court, ordered Ramos to file the brief and appendices on or before December 14, 1998 and to set the argument not earlier than January 25, 1999.

45. Said appeal schedule violates Appellate Rule 4 (a) (4), Schroeder v. McDonald, 55 F 3rd 454, 458 (9th Cir. 1995) that suspends the notice of appeal until the disposition of the post-judgment motion Ramos filed on October 14, 1998.

46. In a letter dated November 9, 1998, Ramos informed Deputy Clerk of this Court, Michael Adragna, of her motion to reconsider the order of September 29, 1998 filed on October 14, 1998 to be heard on October 27, 1998, adjourned to November 10, 1998 at 4:30 P.M. No such entry appeared anywhere in 95 CV 3192 and 98-6901.

RECEIVED
SEP 23 1998
11:17

47. The order of August 23, 1999 signed by Ms. Greenberg, for Karen Greve Milton, Acting Clerk of this Court, denied as moot Ramos' motion to suspend her appeal of December 7, 1998.

48. Ramos was again ordered to file her papers on or before September 10, 1999, on or before September 20, 1999 and the argument not earlier than the week of November 29, 1999.

49. Ramos filed a notice of appeal on September 8, 1999 from the District Court's memorandum and order (99 CV 1256) filed on August 6, 1999 and the judgment dated August 12, 1999.

50. On September 17, 1999, Ramos delivered to the Attorney General's Office a copy of her motion to consolidate the appeals without this Court's docket number for 99 CV 1256.

51. Since Ramos was running out of time, even though she was not yet assigned a docket number from this Court, on September 21, 1999, she filed at this Court her motion to consolidate 98-6901 and 99 CV 1256.

52. On the same day, Ramos filed Forms C and D, copies of the District Court's Judgment dated August 12, 1999, the District Court's memorandum and order filed on August 6, 1999 as well as the New York State Supreme Court, Appellate Division's opinion and order dated February 20, 1996.

FILED
SEP 21 1999
CLERK OF COURT
11:17

53. The order of November 12, 1999 (Friday) consolidating the appeals (Ramos received on November 19, 1999), for the third time, ordered Ramos to file her appeal papers on or before November 14, 1999 (Sunday), on or before January 18, 2000 and the argument not earlier than the week of February 29, 2000.

54. Ramos also received a letter dated November 15, 1999 from Deputy Clerk Michael Adragna with an enclosed very confusing and indistinguishable format of the consolidated captions, again omitting the name of defendant-appellee John A. Monteleone.

55. Ramos considered it urgent and imperative to file her motion of November 23, 1999 to correct the errors she noted.

56. In a letter dated October 6, 1999 to Deputy Clerk Angela Brogna in reference to 99-9084, she was informed of Ramos' demand for damages as discussed at page 4, paragraph 9 and page 8, paragraph 29 of this petition.

57. In said letter, Ramos corrected the dates of the corresponding docket entries of 99-9084 from September 17, 1999 to September 21, 1999; however, as of January 21, 2000 the erroneous dates have not been corrected to reflect the true dates.

58. Ramos' letter of November 1, 1999 confirmed a telephone conversation on October 28, 1999 at 2:50 P.M. in which

LE:1111 200310

Deputy Clerk Brogna said that there is no way she can change the caption to include defendant-appellee John A. Monteleone.

(Docket entry of 99-9084, November 3, 1999).

59. Ms. Brogna enclosed in her letter of October 19, 1999 to Ramos (received on October 28, 1999) a copy of the caption of the appeal (99-9084) that omitted the name of John A. Monteleone.

60. Ramos' letter of November 1, 1999 to the Attorney General confirmed a telephone conversation on October 29, 1999 at 10:20 A.M. Ramos requested to stipulate with AAG Speres to correct the entries of 99 CV 1256. (99-9084, November 3, 1999).

61. Ramos' letter of November 10, 1999 confirmed a telephone conversation on November 9, 1999 at 2:45 P.M., in which AAG Speres' turned down Ramos' request to clarify the issues in her motion to correct the errors in the docket entries of 99 CV 1256. (Docket entry of 99-9084, November 12, 1999).

62. The entry of December 8, 1999 (99-9084 (Con) must delete "Order endorsed on motion dated November 3, 1999". There is a separate order before Honorable Circuit Judge Robert D. Sack.

63. The docket entries of the consolidated 98-6901 (L) did not delete the "et al" in the caption. The consolidated caption still omitted the name of defendant-appellee John A. Monteleone.

CO FEB 22 11:17

64. Ramos' letter of December 21, 1999 to John Brownsky, Criminal Division of the U S Attorney, EDNY, confirmed a telephone conversation with him on December 10, 1999 at 11:20 A.M. (docket entry of 98-6901 (L), December 22, 1999).


65. Ramos explained in said letter that had her order to show cause filed on July 15, 1997, with the memorandum of law and affidavit in support, been filled up at the District Court, Ramos could have sent to the U S Attorney's office from the start copies of her legal papers.

66. The docket entries must be amended to correspond with the actual dates and true facts that had happened in these cases.

WHEREFORE, the petitioner requests that this Court grants this petition and for such other relief as this Court deems just.

Dated: Queens, New York
February 22, 2000

Respectfully submitted,


-NORA Z. RAMOS

Pro se

P.O. Box 70-1190

East Elmhurst, New York 11370-3190

(718) 956 - 1854

RECEIVED
FEB 22 11 18 AM '00

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

-----X
In Re: NORA Z. RAMOS, Esq., An Attorney
and Counselor-at-Law,

Respondent - Petitioner,

GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK,

Docket No.
98-6901 (L)

Petitioner - Respondent,

v.

NORA Z. RAMOS, Esq.,

Respondent - Petitioner.

-----X
NORA Z. RAMOS, Esq.,

Plaintiff - Petitioner,

Docket No.
99-9084 (Con)

v.

GUY JAMES MANGANO, Presiding Justice
of the Appellate Division, Second Department
of the Supreme Court of the State of
New York, Associate Justices VINCENT R.
BALLETTA, JR., ALBERT M. ROSENBLATT,
CORNELIUS J. O'BRIEN, THOMAS R.
SULLIVAN, Justice, ROBERT H. STRAUS
and BARRY KAMINS Chief Counsel and
Chairman, respectively, of the Grievance
Committee for the Second and Eleventh
Judicial Districts (Grievance Committee),
JOHN DOES and/or JANE DOES (1-20),
Being Present Members of the Grievance
Committee, JOHN A. MONTELEONE,
Being a Special Referee, and DAVID
C. Y. CHEUNG, Being Assistant Counsel
to Robert H. Straus, all in their
official and personal capacities,

CERTIFICATE
OF SERVICE
BY MAIL

Defendants - Respondents.

-----X
FEB 22 11:18

98-6901 (L) Grievance Committee v. Ramos
99-9084 (Con) Ramos v. Mangano, et al

- 2 -

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, ANTONIETTA MAGLIPON, hereby certify under penalty of perjury that on February 22, 2000, I served to the New York State Attorney General's Office, two copies of the attached Petition for hearing to review denial of motion for reconsideration; to decide on 11/23/99 motion; and to correct the docket entries of 98-6901 (L) and 99-9084 (Con).

I deposited the true copies (2) thereof enclosed in a post-paid envelope, by certified mail, R R R, to the United States Post Office in New York State, addressed to:

ELIOT SPITZER
Attorney General of the
State of New York
Attorney for the State Defendants
120 Broadway
New York, New York 10271

Attention CONSTANTINE A. SPERES, A A G

Dated: Queens, New York
February 22, 2000

Antonietta Maglipo
ANTONIETTA MAGLIPON

20 FEB 22 11:18

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

In Re: NORA Z. RAMOS, Esq., An Attorney
and Counselor-at-Law,

Respondent - Petitioner,

Docket No.
98-6901 (L)

GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK,

Petitioner - Respondent,

v.

NORA Z. RAMOS, Esq.,

Respondent - Petitioner.

NORA Z. RAMOS, Esq.,

Plaintiff - Petitioner,


Docket No.
99-9084 (Con)

v.

GUY JAMES MANGANO, Presiding Justice
of the Appellate Division, Second Department
of the Supreme Court of the State of
New York, Associate Justices VINCENT R.
BALLETTA, JR., ALBERT M. ROSENBLATT,
CORNELIUS J. O'BRIEN, THOMAS R.
SULLIVAN, Justice, ROBERT H. STRAUS
and BARRY KAMINS, Chief Counsel and
Chairman, respectively, of the Grievance
Committee for the Second and Eleventh
Judicial Districts (Grievance Committee),
JOHN DOES and/or JANE DOES (1-20),
Being Present Members of the Grievance
Committee, JOHN A. MONTELEONE,
Being a Special Referee, and DAVID
C. Y. CHEUNG, Being Assistant Counsel
to Robert H. Straus, all in their
official and personal capacities,

PETITION FOR
HEARING TO
REVIEW DENIAL
OF MOTION FOR
RECONSIDERATION;
TO DECIDE ON
11/23/99 MOTION;
TO CORRECT
DOCKET ENTRIES
OF 98-6901 (L)
AND 99-9084 (CON)

Defendants - Respondents.


NORA Z. RAMOS
Pro se
P.O. Box 70-1190
East Elmhurst, N Y 11370-3190

(718) 956-1854

To

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
SECOND CIRCUIT

Service of a copy of the within is hereby admitted.

RECEIVED
FEB 22 1999

Dated:

Attorney(s) for

.....